

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.5843 of 2020

=====

Sona Devi, wife of Late Fuldev Singh @ Late Fuldev Prasad Yadav, resident of village-Pirouchha, Post-Kanta Pirouchha, P.S. Gaighat, District Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Education Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Programme Officer (Establishment), Muzaffarpur, District Muzaffarpur.
3. The Treasury Officer, Muzaffarpur, District - Muzaffarpur.
4. The State Bank of India through the Chief General Manager, State Bank of India, Local Head Office, West Gandhi Maidan, Patna.
5. The General Manager, State Bank of India, Centralized Pension Processing Centre, Judges Court Road, Anta Ghat, Patna.
6. The Branch Manager, State Bank of India, Kanta Branch, District-Muzaffarpur.
7. The Accountant General, Bihar, Patna.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondents	:	Smt. Binita Singh (SC28)
For State Bank of India	:	Mr. Kaushal Choudhary, Advocate
For Accountant General	:	Mr. S.M. Ehtesham, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR UPADHYAY
ORAL JUDGMENT

Date : 26-06-2020

Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State, learned counsel for the Accountant General and learned counsel of the State of Bank of India.

The instant writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs:-

“(I) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and



directing the Respondent Bank to revise and pay the family pension of the petitioner in view of the revision made by the office of the Accountant General, Bihar, Patna vide Pen-14 Sa. 1101 dated 17.08.2017 as well as the subsequent letter issued by the Respondent no. 3 addressed to the Respondent no.6 vide letter no.777 dated 12.04.2018.

(II) For issuance of an appropriate writ in the nature of MANDAMUS, commanding and directing the Respondent Bank to pay the arrears of differences of family pension with statutory as well as penal interest as also the litigation cost for unnecessary harassment of the petitioner by the Respondent Bank.

(III) For issuance of any other appropriate writ/writs, order/orders, direction/directions for which the writ petitioner shall be found entitled under the facts and circumstances of the case.”

The petitioner, who is 79 years old, raises her grievance that after issuance of revised PPO on 17.08.2017 and issuance of letter by the Treasury Officer, Muzaffarpur, the petitioner has not been paid revised family pension by the respondent-Bank.

Considering the aforesaid, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to ensure payment of entire dues against the revised pension in terms of the revised PPO, if not already paid to the petitioner, at the earliest preferably within a period of four months from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, failing which the petitioner would be entitled to interest at the rate of 9% per annum from the date of filing of the writ petition i.e. 26.05.2020 till the date



of actual payment.

With the aforesaid observation and direction, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

(Anil Kumar Upadhyay, J)

BT/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	29.06.2020
Transmission Date	N.A.

